



## MEMORANDUM

EDAW INC

THE BILTMORE

817 WEST PEACHTREE  
STREET, NW

SUITE 770

ATLANTA GEORGIA

30308

**TO** Jeff Browning, Robin Bechtel  
**FROM** Fredalyn M. Frasier  
**DATE** June 27, 2005  
**CC** Ellen Heath  
**SUBJECT** Community Workshop Evans & Martinez Area - June 29, 2005 - Detailed

---

TEL 404 870 5339

FAX 404 870 6590

www.edaw.com

The following is a summary of the major issues and themes from the June 29<sup>th</sup> Growth Management Plan Update workshop for the Evans and Martinez Areas. The summary includes a listing of the participants.

The workshop for the Evans and Martinez Area was well attended with 66 members of the general public present for the workshop. Attendance by the steering committee was strong at ten members.

The presentation covered the growth management planning process, the draft community assessment, and a discussion of the nodal development concept. Discussion focused on the nodal development concept, especially the relationship between land use and transportation.

There was a general consensus for the proposed nodes; however, the management of future development within these areas was a significant concern. Several individuals stated implementation would be critical step toward ensuring strip development does not become the predominate development pattern in the Evans and Martinez area. It was also stressed that greenspace preservation and alternative modes of transportation will support the nodal growth pattern.

Highlights of the discussion included:

1. The importance of coordinating the transportation infrastructure and future development to promote accessibility and reduce congestion in the county. Citizens strongly expressed the need to address the increasing congestion in the Evans and Martinez Area. The consultants explained that the prevailing knowledge among planners is that density and mixed use in appropriate places can help alleviate traffic congestion.
2. The need to incorporate alternative modes of transportation within and between the proposed nodes –such as bike lanes and sidewalks. Several participants suggested making the Evans and Martinez area more pedestrian and bicycle friendly. It was pointed out that in addition to reducing vehicle trips providing alternative modes also promotes healthier living.
3. The provision of greenspace within the nodes and between the nodes was emphasized. Greenspace was regarded as an important amenity that will ensure Columbia County maintains its high quality of life.
4. The idea to promote growth farther west as opposed to concentrating growth within the nodes.

Some participants wanted to see growth pushed farther west and suggested the county provide the road infrastructure to support expansion west of the Evans Town Center. The consultants pointed out that such an approach would actually promote sprawl which would further exacerbate the traffic situation and increase the county's cost of providing services.

5. The type of multifamily proposed – participants expressed the desire to have quality multifamily.  
Several participants expressed concern about subsidized housing in the county.
6. The ensuring the principles of the nodal concept are followed as part of implementation. Other implementation issues presented by the participants:
  - a. How will specific land uses be arranged within the nodes? There was significant discussion related to how to limit multiple uses on similar corners or intersections.
  - b. How will a node evolve to the next level? Participants wanted to make sure that a policy was outlined to address nodal expansion.

## Priorities and Issues

Meeting attendees were presented with the priorities identified by the steering committee, and agreed that these were appropriate priorities for the growth management plan update.

As reflected in the general discussion, there was general consensus that traffic congestion was the top concern of the attendees. Second, was the need to preserve existing single family neighborhoods and protecting water resources and sensitive lands was a close third in terms of priorities.

## Evans and Martinez Area

### Public Participants

Al Gray	Aleta Williamson	Ben S. Davis
Bill Kegg	Billye Hansford	Bob Cipperly
C. Wayne Hubbard	Catherine Chase	Catherine Mares
Charles Allen	Charles Dunston	Charles Whitworth
Costa Pappis	Craig Zimmerman	Daniel Godera
Dave Trotter	Debbie Nichols	Dempsey M. Lively
Don Knab	Don Lindsey	Donna Redd
Fran Stewart	Garry Richardson	Given Wood
Howard Strickland	Ira Tindall	J.P. Graham
Jan Zimmerman	Jeff Drake	Jeri Wilkomade
John Teasley	Judith Love	Judy Teasley
Kay Purvis	Kay Vaught	Ken Richards
Ken Turner	Kent Gilbreath	Lori Purvis
Lyle Self	Maria Russell	Mary Bannan
Mary Schroer	Michale Bannan	Mike Moosari
Pam Wills	Patricia Smith	Paul Petersen
Paula Henao	Peter Shipman	Priscilla Quagliions
Quandia Collin	Rob Pavey	Ron Jackson
Steve Buck	Suzi Gilbreath	Todd Bailly
Tom Vaught	Tom Werner	Vera Lively
Vernon Smith	W.C. Maye	

### Steering Committee Participants

Denise Vining  
Ed Cavaleri  
Ed Dickerson  
Gary Best  
Greg Kernaghan  
Jake Ivery  
Jeri Whitworth  
Julie Batchelor  
Oliver Owens  
Steve Morris

### Consultants and Staff

Jeff Browning, Planning Director  
Robin Bechtel, Project Manager  
Tom Tully, County Planning  
Ellen Heath, EDAW - Principal  
Fredalyn M. Frasier, EDAW – Project Manager  
Louis Merlin, EDAW  
Amy Lang, EDAW  
Glenn Coyne, Coyne Planning Associates

### Specific Questions/Comments:

1. How does the growth management plan account for and predict future growth and changes?  
(Response - 5 year updates, revise policies, establish criteria)
2. Recommend looking at the structure within the nodes as well, such as road network and existing development patterns.
3. Node concept is a great idea, but we're doomed already since the county has already zoned significant parcels between nodes for commercial.  
(Response – corridor overlay districts, buffers, transitional uses)
4. Concerned that attracting higher incomes and attracting businesses is not reflected in “commercial” nodes. What about light industry?  
(Response – nodal concept does recommend employment within nodes, however, light industry is designated elsewhere in the plan)
5. Suspicious about high density in nodes; do not want apartments in the county, only want to be a bedroom community
6. Nodes sound nice, but strip development is already occurring on Washington Road, creating traffic congestion. Also, what happens when all of these new shops go out of business, leaving vacancies in the strip centers?
7. Road system is lagging behind development; why don't you leapfrog out with next phase of commercial growth, away from residential areas?  
(Response – would create sprawl and worse traffic, plus would be more costly to provide services)

8. Plan is great, but problem is implementation, i.e. not every business should have a curb cut, need to provide interconnectivity between uses. Columbia County has made the choice to be auto dependent; need to provide bike, pedestrian connections.  
(Response – nodal concept strongly recommends connections within nodes and between adjoining uses)
9. Nodes already exist, but need 2 important factors; a) incentives for developers and b) a backbone for implementation with no spot zoning. We have “clusters of reactionary urbanism” in Columbia County.
10. Keep Evans to Locks and Fury’s Ferry Road as a Tier 3.
11. Request for example cities that use the nodal concept.  
(Response – Smart Growth is fairly new, but see Cary, NC, Callaway, FL, and Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN)
12. Did you look at demographics and commuting patterns of residents?  
(Response – Yes, but predict job growth within the county and trying to locate places for those uses)
13. 30 years ago there was no planning, glad to see it is happening now
14. No such thing as a perfect system, but we need to plan for the future.
15. Other cities are not always centered on the major intersection, but different functions at each quadrant.
16. Long range plan should have a relationship with DOT so that growth and roads are coordinated. The two planning efforts – land use and transportation – should “feed” each other.
17. Concerned about bringing workplaces into a bedroom community; want to keep it residential only.
18. Discussion about multi-family. Does multifamily contribute to the tax base? Are you talking about government-subsidized apartments? The group that spoke does not want apartments.